

In The United States Patent And Trademark Office

Applicant: Pentti Rautiainen Date: July 9, 2003
 Date Filed: November 10, 2001 Docket No.: FORSAL-28
 App. No.: 10/019,865 Art Unit: 1731
 For: Method for the Manufacture of Examiner: M. Halpern
 Paper, and Paper Machine Line

Certificate of Facsimile Transmission
 I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted
 via facsimile to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

on July 9, 2003
 Date


 Signature
 Patrick J. G. Stiennon, Reg. No. 34934
 Name of applicant, assignee or Registered Representative

Response

Commissioner for Patents
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Claims 31–64 remain pending in the application. In the Office Action dated May 19, 2003, claims 31–64 were rejected by the examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Ahonen et al.* (6,413,371) in view of *Wurster* (5,916,420). However *Ahonen et al.* has a PCT publication date of December 16, 1999, while the present application has a priority date of May 12, 1999, based on Finnish application No. 991096. Therefore *Ahonen et al.* is only a reference, if at all, under 102 (e). Furthermore, *Ahonen et al.* has an international filing date of May 28, 1999 which is before November 29, 2000 the effective date of §13205 of Pub. L 107-273, and therefore *Ahonen et al.* is a 102(e) reference only as of December 8, 2000--its § 371 (c)(1), (2), (4) date--which is after the effective filing date of the present application (May 12, 1999, based on Finnish application 991096). *Ahonen et al.* is therefore not a reference. See MPEP §706.02(f)(1), Example 6.

FAX RECEIVED
 JUL 10 2003
 GROUP 1700

Applicant: Pentti Rautainen
Application No.: 10/019,865
Art Unit: 1731

Statement of Common Ownership

Furthermore, *Ahonen et al.* is owned by Metso Paper, Inc.(formerly Valmet Corporation) The present application was, at the time of invention, assigned to or subject to an obligation to assign to the same party: Metso Paper, Inc. (formerly Valmet Corporation).

The present application No. 10/019865 and the *Ahonen et al.* Patent No. 6,413,371 were, at the time the invention of application 10/019865 was made, owned by Metso Paper, Inc. During the time in question Valmet Corporation changed it's name to Metso Paper, Inc. But the invention of the Application No. 10/019865 and the *Ahonen et al.* Patent No. 6,413,371 were at all times owned by the same entity.

Because *Ahonen et al.* is not a reference, the only possible rejection over *Ahonen et al.* would be based on obviousness type double patenting. However, for the purposes of double patenting it is only the claims of *Ahonen et al.* and the claims of the present application that must be considered. The claims of *Ahonen et al.* and the claims of the present application are patentably distinct. The claims of the application are directed to a papermaking machine which allows several different paper grades to be manufactured with high efficiency. The papermaking machine is arranged such that the stock volume in the short circulation is minimized which speeds grade changes, because a change of stock takes less time. The press section uses at least one long nip press to achieve high dry solids content and the drying section uses impingement drying in addition to cylinder drying which allows a rapid adjustment of drying capability which facilitates change in paper grade.

After the drying section the paper web is passed through a pre-calender and following the pre-calender the web is pre-coated, after which the web is dried in a contact-free manner in an intermediate dryer section and then is passed to a coating unit followed by an after drying section then directly to a calender in which the load of each nip can be regulated separately, followed by a reel. This arrangement is not obvious in view of the claims of *Ahonen et al.* and so an obviousness type double patenting rejection is not proper.

It would not be possible to manufacture in a papermaking line by the method taught

Applicant: Pentti Rautainen
Application No.: 10/019,865
Art Unit: 1731

FAX RECEIVED
GROUP 100
JUL 10 2003

by the claims of *Ahonen et al.* the same type of coated fine paper as sought in the arrangement in accordance with the present invention. Combining *Wurster* with the claims of *Ahonen et al.* would not make the present invention obvious to a person skilled in the art because neither the claims of *Ahonen et al.* nor *Wurster* mention anything about minimization of the stock volume to achieve a short grade change time. Further, *Wurster* does not employ pre-calendering before coating and neither of these references coat the web in two stages between which stages the web is dried.

Applicant submits that the claims are allowable. Favorable action thereon is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



Patrick J. G. Stiennon, Reg. No. 34934
Attorney for Applicant
Stiennon & Stiennon
P.O. Box 1667
Madison, Wisconsin 53701-1667
(608) 250-4870
Amdt1.rgs/amdt